Person-Organization Fit and Mission Command
Why Developing a Mission Command Subset of Leadership Attributes
Can Facilitate the Army-wide Implementation of the Mission Command Philosophy

White Paper
September - 2015

Human Dimension Capabilities Development Task Force
Capabilities Development Integration Directorate
Mission Command Center of Excellence (MC CoE)

Executive Summary

In this paper, the Human Dimension Capabilities Development Task Force (HDCDTF) presents an argument for conducting an analytical review of current leadership doctrine in order to identify a sub-set of leader attributes and competencies deemed to be the most critical for the effective practice of Mission Command. The HDCDTF also presents a model for ensuring that the Army maintains Person-Organization fit, as it progresses towards the goal of Army-wide implementation of Mission Command and its accompanying Warfighting Function and Systems.

The adoption of Mission Command as the Army's doctrinally preferred method of command and control represents more than just a shift in how leaders command, it represents a change in organizational philosophy and culture. This change makes it necessary for the Army to readdress the relationship between the Mission Command behaviors it seeks, the leaders capable of conducting these behaviors, and the organizational environment in which these leaders develop and function. This change also means that the Army must place an emphasis on being able to identify and develop leaders who are both capable of conducting Mission Command themselves, and also predisposed to empower their subordinates to do the same when the situation so warrants.

Despite the fact that the Army has created a doctrinal framework for implementing Mission Command, their progress at actually doing so is being hindered by a lack of uniform understanding of Mission Command across the institutional and operational Army. This lack of a uniform understanding further inhibits the development of Mission Command capable leaders due to the fact that leader development within the Army relies heavily on mentorship. In order to facilitate a more complete implementation and uniform understanding of Mission Command throughout the Total Army, the HDCDTF proposes the following two recommendations:

1. The Army should conduct an analytical review of the existing leadership doctrine in order to identify those leader attributes most essential for the effective practice of Mission Command, and

2. Based upon this analysis, the Army should apply Bowen, Ledford, and Nathan's "Model for Hiring with Person-Organization Fit," or a similar model, to ensure that there is internal consistency in the Army's talent optimization system, with all functional components -- recruitment, selection, development, promotion, and retention -- focusing on these most essential attributes.

Introduction

After experiencing over a decade of conflict the US Army has entered a period of reflection, during which it has recommitted its focus on readiness, begun to prepare for the future, and invested in ensuring that the world's premier all volunteer land force remains capable of being both agile and adaptive as it meets the challenges of the future.[1, 2] In order to develop the Army of the future, the current Chief of Staff of the Army (CSA) GEN Mark. A. Milley has stated that the Army must have "an openness to new ideas and new ways of doing things in an increasingly complex world," and that the Army "will change and adapt."[3]

One of the ideas that has evolved over the last decade of conflict is the philosophy of Mission Command. Mission Command has evolved from being a unique style or technique of decentralized command and control available to Army leaders within the framework of Battle Command, to being the Army's doctrinally-preferred philosophy of command and control, as well as a Warfighting Function replete with an enabling Mission Command system.[4]

The Army has identified force-wide implementation of the Mission Command Philosophy and its accompanying Warfighting Function and Systems as a strategic organizational goal (See FIGURE # in Appendix A).[5] Despite the fact that the Army has created a doctrinal framework for implementing Mission Command, actually doing so is hindered by a lack of uniform understanding of Mission Command across the institutional and operational Army.[6] In order to facilitate a more complete implementation and uniform understanding of Mission Command throughout the Total Army, the HDCDTF proposes the following two recommendations:

1. The Army should conduct an analytical review of the existing leadership doctrine in order to identify those leader attributes most essential for the effective practice of Mission Command, and

2. Based upon this analysis, the Army should apply Bowen, Ledford, and Nathan's "Model for Hiring with Person-Organization Fit," or a similar model, to ensure that there is internal consistency in the Army's talent optimization system, with all functional components -- recruitment, selection, development, promotion, and retention -- focusing on these most essential attributes.

---

[1] Department of the Army. *Army Strategic Planning Guidance: 2014.* 1-4.

[2] GEN Mark Milley, *CSA Initial Message to the Army, 2015.*

[3] *Ibid.*

[4] Department of the Army, *US Army Mission Command Strategy: FY 13-19.* June 2013. 1.

[5] *Ibid.*

[6] *Ibid.,* 2.

Clarification of Purpose

These recommendations should not be interpreted as criticism of how the Army currently approaches leadership. It is, in fact, the opposite. Multiple organizations within the Army, in particular the Center for Army Leadership (CAL), have conducted advanced work to define and characterize what the archetype of Army leadership and behavior is through attributes and competencies, and to outline the Army's leadership philosophy.

These efforts contribute to the Army's reputation as a cornerstone of leadership within American society. Army leadership doctrine, unlike other doctrine, applies to all Army leaders and every Army organization. By definition, leadership in the Army is "the process of influencing people by providing purpose, direction, and motivation to accomplish the mission and improve the organization."[7] By identifying a sub-set of leadership attributes and competencies that are necessary for Mission Command, the Army can provide direction for the transition as well as develop the necessary organizational mechanisms required to implement the change and improve the organization. Conversely, by failing to highlight a subset of attributes and competencies needed for Mission Command, the Army may inadvertently signal that the change in organizational philosophy is not important enough to adapt to. Without clearly defining, articulating, validating and assessing attributes and competencies for Mission Command, leaders may be able to continue outmoded practices regardless of how often the Army mentions Mission Command in doctrine.

It is because leadership doctrine is ubiquitous and permeates nearly every aspect of the organization that it represents one avenue for advancing a uniform understanding and internalization of Mission Command throughout the entire Army. While this paper presents one course of action, there may be other courses of action that the Army can take in order to accelerate the implementation of Mission Command.

Change in Organizational Culture Requires Change throughout the Organization

The shift to Mission Command represents a major transformation in the Army's operating philosophy and organizational culture.[8] This transformation affects the Army from tooth to tail, and will require changes in how the Army approaches the recruitment, selection, promotion, and retention of its leaders.

---

[7] Department of the Army, *ADRP 6-22: Army Leadership*. September 2012: 1.
[8] Department of the Army, *US Army Mission Command Strategy: FY 13-19*. June 2013. 4.

The first step in securing leaders capable of conducting Mission Command is identifying the behaviors required for implementing the philosophy. The principles of Mission Command have identified that all Army leaders will need to be capable of building cohesive teams through mutual trust and shared understanding, which exercise disciplined initiative and accept prudent risk in order to achieve their commander's intent

"The Army should work to identify those characteristics and attributes that enable individuals to carry out each [Mission Command] behavior."

as conveyed through mission orders (For a list of the Principles see Figure # in Appendix A).[9,10] Army leaders will also need to be predisposed to empower their own subordinates to do the same when the situation so warrants.

After identifying the desired behaviors for Mission Command (through the principles of Mission Command), the next step for the Army should be to identify those characteristics and attributes that enable individuals to carry out each behavior. Identifying this subset of leadership attributes will enable the Army to foster a uniform understanding of Mission Command across the force by emphasizing those attributes. Identifying attributes and competencies for enabling specific behaviors will highlight the "who" and the "what" for the implementation of Mission Command. However, unless the Army also reinforces these behaviors and characteristics by reassessing Person-Organization (P-O) fit, the changes will likely not be enduring and the culture shift required for the Army-wide implementation of Mission Command may not occur.

Person-Organization Fit

P-O fit is part of a larger concept which researchers of organizational behavior call Person-Environment fit (P-E fit).[11] Organizational psychologists have suggested that P-E fit, and its related sub concepts are directly related to recruitment and selection decisions, occupational choice, employee job satisfaction, job performance, commitment to an organization, employee turnover, and psychological and physical well-being.[12,13,14,15] While it has multiple definitions,

---

[9] Department of the Army, *ADP 6-0: Mission Command 2014*, 2-5.

[10] Department of the Army, *US Army Mission Command Strategy: FY 13-19. 2013*, 2.

[11] Jeffrey Edwards. "Person-Environment Fit in Organizations: An Assessment of Theoretical Progress," *The Academy of Management Annals 2*, no. 1 (2008):168.

[12] Jeffrey Edwards, Daniel Cable, Ian Williamson, Lisa Schurer Lambert, and Abbie Shipp. "The Phenomenology of Fit: Linking the Person and Environment to the Subjective Experience of Person-Environment Fit," *Journal of Applied Psychology 91*, no. 4 (2006): 802.

[13] Jeffrey Edwards, "Person-Job Fit: A Conceptual integration, Literature Review and Methodological critique," *International Review of Industrial/Organizational Psychology 6* (1991): 283-357.

[14] Timothy Judge, Amy Kristof-Brown, "Personality, Interactional Psychology and Person-Organization Fit." 2004 Personality, in *Personality and Organizations* (New Jersey: Lawrence Earlbaum Associates, 2004): 87-109.

[15] Amy Kristoff, "Person-Organization Fit: An Integrative Review of its conceptualizations, measurement, and implications." *Journal of Personnel Psychology 49*. (1996): 25-30

this paper uses the definition that states that P-E fit is "the similarity between the person and the social environment, which can refer to individuals, groups, organizations, or vocations." [16,17,18]

Using this definition, there are three types or echelons of P-E fit which relate to the Army and range from individual fit within the organization to assessing an individual's fit with a specific task or job. *Figure 1* provides definitions for each type of P-E fit, and an Army specific example.

Level of Person Environment Fit		US Army Example
Person-Organization (P-O Fit)	Defined as "compatibility between people and organizations that occurs when at least one entity provides what the other needs or they share similar fundamental characteristics or both."[19]	US Army
Person-Group (P-G Fit)	Defined as the compatibility between individuals and their work groups.[20]	Branch or Unit
Person-Task (P-T Fit)	Defined as the fit between the abilities of a person and the demands of a job/task, or the desires of a person and the attributes of a job/task.[21]	Military Occupational Specialty

Figure 1. Levels of Person-Environment Fit

Behavior is a Function of the Person and Environment.

The Army, when selecting and retaining soldiers and civilians, should be concerned first and foremost with P-O fit. The majority of career paths in the Army, both uniformed and civilian, evolve over the course of a career from performing a specific job or task upon entry into the organization to performing a completely different task after subsequent promotions or a lateral shift in career path. The values, principles, and philosophy of an organization are typically stable and enduring across time. Therefore, understanding P-O fit involves assessing whether an individual's values, principles, or philosophy align or fit with the organization's. If an individual

---

[16] Edwards, "Person-Environment Fit in Organizations: An Assessment of Theoretical Progress," 168.

[17] Jennifer Chatman, "Improving Interactional Organizational Research: A Model of Person-Organization Fit." *Academy of Management Review 14*, no. 3 (1989): 339.

[18] Kristof-Brown, "Person-Organization Fit: An Integrative Review of its conceptualizations, measurement, and implications," 6-9.

[19] Amy Kristof-Brown, Ryan Zimmerman, and Erin Johnson, "Consequences of Individuals' Fit at Work: A Meta-Analysis of Person-Job, Person-Organization, Person-Group, and Person-Supervisor Fit," *Personnel Psychology 58*, no. 2. (2005): 281-342.

[20] Kristof-Brown, "Person-Organization Fit: An Integrative Review of its conceptualizations, measurement, and implications," 7.

[21] *Ibid.,* 8.

lacks P-O fit with their organization, then they may exhibit behaviors which clash with those desired by the organization, or look to leave the organization altogether.[22,23]

We know from the theories of P-O fit that any successful changes made in an organization's culture or in defining an organization's philosophy require or lead to changes in how members of that organization behave. In order to ensure P-O fit, the organization must comprehensively examine and analyze not only the desired behaviors, but also the characteristics of the person capable of fulfilling these behaviors. Furthermore, it has to determine whether the organizational environment is conducive to these behaviors and individuals. This process can be illustrated by the heuristic formula known as Lewin's Equation, ($B = f(P, E)$), which was developed in order to help understand and describe how behaviors are a function of both the individuals exhibiting them and their environment. [24,25,26]

Here, a modified version of this equation will be utilized in order to highlight this relationship as well as the fact that the Army's current system may lack the balance required to ensure the desired behaviors occur. Within this equation, the behavior variable (B) is made up of the command and leadership behaviors required for the implementation of a specific type of Command and Control. The person variable (P) is described by the set of identified attributes and competencies that the organization looks for in a leader. The internal organization Environment variable (E^i) is the aggregate of all mechanisms that shape the values, principles, philosophy and culture of the organization.

$$B = f(P, E^i, E^e)$$

B	Behavior
P	Person
E^i	Internal Organization Environment
E^e	External Operating Environment

Figure 2. Modified Version of Lewin's Equation

Examples of these mechanisms include but are not limited to: doctrine, Command and Control philosophies and systems, education and development structures, and personnel management systems. The final variable is the external operating environment (E^e), which is an independent variable that is constantly evolving as new technologies are developed and trends in regional stability and instability shift around the world (see *Figure 2* for an algebraic representation).[27]

Applying the Equation

In this section, the adjusted equation is applied to three different scenarios in order to illustrate that the current situation allows for ambiguity in the understanding and implementation of Mission Command.

---

[22] David Bowen, Gerald Ledford, and Barry Nathan. "Hiring for the organization, not the job." *The Executive 5*, no 4. (1991): 38.

[23] *Ibid.*

[24] Kurt Lewin, "Dynamic Theory of Personality." (New York: Mcgraw Hill, 1935): 73.

[25] Chatman, "Improving Interactional Organizational Research: A Model of Person-Organization Fit," 333.

[26] Benjamin Schneider, "Fits about Fit." *Applied Psychology: An International Review 50*, no. 1 (2001): 145.

[27] Department of the Army. *Army Strategic Planning Guidance 2014.* 1-4.

Scenario 1 Before Mission Command	$$\underset{\text{Battle Command}}{\text{B}} = f\left(\ \underset{\Sigma\text{ of Leadership}}{\text{P}}\ ,\ \underset{\text{Battle Command}}{\text{E}^{i}}\ ,\ \text{E}^{e}\ \right)$$

Figure 3. Modified Equation applied to the Situation prior to Mission Command

The first scenario (*Figure 3*) represents the situation before the Army adopted MC as its doctrinally-preferred method for command and control. Within this equation, the identified behaviors support the philosophy of Battle Command, and the centralization of command authority. The person is characterized by current leadership doctrine (ADP 6-22), which consists of a summation of leadership theory and was originally developed prior to the adoption of Mission Command.[28] The internal organizational environment and personnel management systems of the Army reinforce the centralized authority behaviors prescribed within the philosophy of Battle Command. Leaders within this environment are assessed by their superiors for how well they fit within the holistic system, which is uniformly understood, reinforced, and practiced throughout the Army.

Scenario 2 Current Situation	$$\underset{\text{Mission Command}}{\text{B}} \approx f\left(\ \underset{\Sigma\text{ of Leadership}}{\text{P}}\ ,\ \underset{\text{BC/MC Transition}}{\text{E}^{i}}\ ,\ \text{E}^{e}\ \right)$$

Figure 4. Modified Equation applied to the Current Situation

The second scenario (*Figure 4*) represents the Army's current situation. The desired leadership behaviors are aligned with the principles of MC in hopes of implementing the philosophy across the Army. Unlike the first scenario, however, there are several factors that make this equation an approximation at best. First, the person variable still consists of a summation of all leadership attributes. This allows for a wide variety of interpretations and prioritizations of leadership attributes, dependent upon a leader's MC Strategy. It also lacks a uniform understanding of Mission Command, as well as the systems and mechanisms required for promoting and reinforcing Mission Command behaviors.

Within the current environment, it is unclear what leadership attributes and competencies promote mission command behaviors. The internal environment provides support for summarizing leadership attributes; however, without describing a subset for Mission

---

[28]Jeffrey Horey, Jon Fallensen, Ray Morath, Brian Cronin, Robert Cassella, Will Franks Jr., and Jason Smith. "Competency Based Future Leadership Requirements." Technical Report 1148. U.S. Army Research Institute for the Behavioral and Social Sciences (2004): 1-65.

Command, the associated support system does not provide the accuracy for ensuring a uniform understanding of what is needed for Mission Command. This lack of uniform understanding can lead to situations where leaders fail to encourage Mission Command behaviors, or even actively discourage these behaviors among their subordinates during the development process.

The potential for this predicament is illustrated within a recent study conducted by the Army Research Institute and published in *Military Psychology*. The authors of the study note that the responsibilities formerly limited to more senior leaders are now being pushed upon junior leaders due to the decentralization of command and increasing battlefield complexities.[29] The study asks a small sample of officers with previous battalion command experience to rate the importance of specific leadership skills or abilities from low to high according to rank. The following characteristics were all listed as being of low-medium importance among Lieutenants and Captains: openness, team building, innovation, planning and organizing, problem solving, relationship building.[30]

"Leaders are charged with mentoring and developing their subordinates, but the extent to which they promote Mission Command is dependent upon their own degree of internalization of the philosophy."

This example highlights a discrepancy between practice and doctrine. Leaders are charged with mentoring and developing their subordinates, but the extent to which they promote Mission Command is dependent upon their own degree of internalization of the philosophy. Subsequently, young leaders who are expected to develop Mission Command behaviors may be assessed and evaluated against their peers within a localized system that does not support (and may even penalize) them for displaying behaviors associated with Mission Command.

Scenario 3 Proposed Recommendation	$\underset{\text{Mission Command}}{\text{B}} = f(\ \underset{\text{MC} \subseteq \text{of Leadership}}{\text{P}}\ ,\ \underset{\text{Mission Command}}{\text{E}^i}\ ,\ \text{E}^e\ )$

Figure 5. Modified Equation Applied to the Situation with Proposed Recommendations

---

[29] Cheryl Paullin, Peter Legree, Andrea Sinclair, Karen Moriarty, Roy Campbell, and Robert Kilcullen. "Delineating Officer Performance and its Determinants." *Military Psychology 26*, no. 4 (2014): 262-263.
[30] *Ibid.*

The third and final scenario (*Figure 5*) depicts the recommendations of this white paper. This model presents a subset of leadership attributes and competencies that are required for the successful implementation of Mission Command and have been identified within current leadership doctrine. These attributes and competencies are then subsequently reinforced through the internal organizational environment and personnel systems that conform to a uniform understanding of Mission Command. Recruiting, developing, and retaining leaders who display Mission Command behaviors is much more likely to occur when the organization not only highlights the desired behaviors, but also understands how to identify and reinforce these behaviors. By striving to maintain P-O fit, the Army stands a much better chance of realizing its three strategic end states of 1) all army leaders understand and practice the Mission Command Strategy; 2) commanders and staffs effectively executing Mission Command Warfighting Function tasks; and 3) having a Mission Command system which enables commanders, staffs, and units to effectively execute Mission Command.[31]

Promoting Person-Organization Fit through Hiring

Ensuring Consistency

The key to recruiting, developing, and retaining leaders who are capable of implementing Mission Command behaviors, and who are also inclined to empower their subordinates to implement the same behaviors, is to build a system around hiring for and maintaining Person-Organization fit. David Bowen, Gerald Ledford and Barry Nathan have developed a model for hiring for Person-Organization fit which closely mirrors the process used by the Army for organizational entry. The researchers framed their model around hiring a "whole" person, capable not only of performing a specific task or job but who also fits into the organizations culture.[32] This model consists of four sequential steps that emphasize P-O fit while still incorporating P-T fit (See *Figure 6*).[33] These steps include: 1) Assessing the overall work environment; 2) Inferring the type of person required; 3) Designing "rites of passage" for organizational entry; and 4) Reinforcing P-O fit once an individual is a member of the organization. While it is not specified, it can be surmised that each step

> 1. **Assess the Overall Work Environment**
>   - Job Analysis
>   - Organizational Analysis
>
> 2. **Infer the Type of Person Required**
>   - Technical Knowledge, Skills and Abilities
>   - Social Skills
>   - Personal Needs, Values, and Interests
>   - Personality Traits
>
> 3. **Design "Rites of Passage" for Organizational Entry that allow both the Organizational and the Applicant to Assess Fit**
>   - Tests of Cognitive, Motor, and Interpersonal Abilities
>   - Interviews by Potential Coworkers and Others
>   - Personality Tests
>   - Realistic Job Previews, Including Work Samples
>
> 4. **Reinforce Person-Organization Fit at Work**
>   - Reinforce Skills and Knowledge Through Task Design and Training
>   - Reinforce Personal Orientation Through Organization Design

Figure 6. Bowen et al.'s Model for Hiring with Person Organization Fit

---

[31] Department of the Army, *US Army Mission Command Strategy: FY 13-19,* 2013, 1.

[32] Bowen, *et al*. "Hiring for the organization, not the job," 35.

[33] *Ibid.,* 38.

is sequential in order. When a characteristic of one step is altered the following steps must be reassessed in order to maintain P-O fit. Each of the steps are discussed in further detail below.

Step One: Assess the Overall Work Environment

The first step, consists of assessing the overall work environment and is divided into two separate areas, one focused on P-T fit and the other on P-O fit. The Army is constantly performing analysis on P-T fit, as specific tasks and jobs are always changing dependent upon technology and the specific demands of the external environment.[34] Conducting organizational analysis occurs less often, as most values, principles, and philosophies of an organization are stable and enduring. [35] However, as we have discussed, the Army recently conducted a review of its own operating philosophy, and decided to develop and implement the philosophy of Mission Command. This change in organizational philosophy has ripple effects through the rest of the steps of the model.

Step Two: Infer the Type of Person Required

The second step of the model involves ascertaining the type of person required by the organization. It is also the focus of the first recommendation mentioned in this white paper. In addition to identifying the task specific requirements of the individual, it is during this step that an organization infers, from the organizational analysis conducted in the first step, "the needs, values, and interests – that is the personality – an [individual] must possess to be an effective member of [leader within] the organization."[36]

The Army has previously conducted this type of analysis with the development of the leadership attributes and competencies model currently found within Army Doctrinal Publication 6-22: Army Leadership. The research conducted during the development of ADP 6-22 and published in 2004, represents a summary of leadership attributes and competencies, and was the first step in developing the competency framework which guides leader development and professionalism within the Army today.[37] The methodology used in the development of the current leadership doctrine should be used as a template for reassessing and validating a subset of leadership attributes and competencies for the successful implementation of Mission Command.

---

[34] Bowen, *et al.* "Hiring for the organization, not the job," 38.
[35] *Ibid.*
[36] *Ibid.,* 39.
[37] Horey, *et al*. "Competency Based Future Leadership Requirements," V.

Step Three: Design "Rites of Passage"

The third step involves designing "Rites of Passage" which allow both the organization and the individual to assess fit.[38] The Army already uses many forms of this step, with two of the most familiar being Initial Entry Training (IET) and Officer Candidacy School (OCS). A rite of passage does not necessarily need to be a physical and mental trial, such as a boot camp experience. They can also consist of screening mechanisms that assess personality or aptitude, individual or group interviews, and realistic job previews.[39] Examples of methods the Army currently utilizes includes the Armed Services Vocational Aptitude Battery (ASVAB) test, the Tailored Adaptive Personality Assessment System (TAPAS), and in depth recruiter-applicants interviews during the recruiting process. Rites of passage which include realistic job previews also allow for the applicant to self-select out if they recognize a lack of fit. This has been hypothesized to result in a higher level of job satisfaction, lower level of voluntary turnover, and higher performance among members who self-select in to the organization.[40]

"Rites of Passage should be designed to emphasize organizational values and reinforce desired behaviors."

It is important that rites of passage are designed and implemented in a manner that supports the identification, and assessment of the applicant to ensure that they display the desired characteristics of the person inferred in step two. Each of these methods is designed to either sort-in or sort-out applicants who display certain characteristics. But without having identified a subset of attributes and competencies for Mission Command, these assessment mechanisms cannot be calibrated to specifically influence the implementation of Mission Command.

The Marine Corps' Crucible is an example of a "rite of passage" designed to emphasize organizational values and reinforce a specific desired behavior. The Crucible is a 54 hour field training test that all Marine recruits must successfully complete in order to graduate from recruit training and be awarded the title 'United States Marine.'[41] By design, the Crucible is so physically and mentally demanding that individuals will fail unless they join their fellow recruits and work closely together as a team. As a result of this trial, Marines with no prior service together can trust each other's character and capability without first having to get to know and observe them. This rite of passage is, therefore, extremely important for an expeditionary force whose units might be task organized and deployed together at any time without the luxury of first training together.

---

[38] Bowen, *et al.* "Hiring for the organization, not the job," 40.
[39] *Ibid.*
[40] James Breaugh and Mary Starke. "Research on Employee Recruitment: So Many Studies, So Many Remaining Questions." *Journal of Management 26*, no. 3 (2000): 415
[41] James Woulfe, *Into the Crucible: The Making of a 21st Century Marine,"* (New York: Presidio Press, 2000): 7-9.

Step Four: Reinforce Person-Organization Fit at Work

The fourth and final step of this model is "reinforcing the P-O fit at work."[42] Any investment of time and resources in identifying and developing the right individuals for Mission Command will be negated if the Army does not also ensure that its current practices align with and reinforce those desired behaviors. The P-O fit can be reinforced through a variety of human resources management practices, and also through training and education.[43]

The Officer Evaluation Report and the Non-Commissioned Officer Evaluation Report are examples of human resources management tools which can have an impact on P-O fit.[44] These personnel assessments allow raters to identify and assess how well individuals incorporate the organization's values, principles, and philosophies into their daily actions. If the Army were to identify and incorporate a set of Mission Command attributes and competencies into these assessment tools, then these tools would serve as reinforcing mechanisms that enable the internalization of the Mission Command principles and the Army-wide implementation of Mission Command.

"If the Army wishes to advance attributes […] then it must ensure that existing practices do not inhibit or discourage them."

Person-Organization fit can also be reinforced through subsequent "Rites of Passage" events designed for entry into sub-groups within the organization. Examples of this type of "Rite of Passage" range from joining a particular sub-group by completing training such as the Army Airborne School or Army Ranger School, to finishing developmental courses which provide career benefits like the School for Advanced Military Studies (SAMS) for uniformed personnel or the Defense Senior Leadership Development Program (DSLDP) for civilian personnel.

The Army must assess whether the shift in organizational culture and operating philosophy is reinforced and promoted through each of these processes or developmental events. If the Army wishes to advance attributes like tolerance of ambiguity, creativity, or innovation within its leadership ranks, then it must ensure that existing developmental and assessment practices do not inhibit or discourage these attributes among leaders.

---

[42] Bowen, *et al.* "Hiring for the organization, not the job," 41.
[43] *Ibid.*
[44] See DA Form 67-10-1A, MAR 2014

Conclusion

As the Army emphasizes readiness and continues to move towards its stated goal of full implementation of the Mission Command philosophy and the associated Warfighting Function and systems, one impediment that continues to slow this implementation is the lack of a uniform understanding of Mission Command. The mentoring nature of leadership development within the Army creates a situation where if current leaders fail to internalize and implement the principles of Mission Command, then it is unlikely that future leaders will develop in a manner that supports Mission Command.

If the Army intends to keep Mission Command as one of the doctrinal foundations of Unified Land Operations, then it needs to take the symbolic, administrative, and developmental steps towards ensuring that all members of the organization embrace the cultural and philosophical transformation. The recommendations in this paper represent two steps that have the potential to carry powerful symbolism, and, more importantly, deliver dynamic results with regards to improving and accelerating the Army-wide internalization and implementation of Mission Command.

Recommendations

1.   The Army should conduct an analytical review of the existing leadership doctrine in order to identify those leader attributes most essential for the effective practice of Mission Command, and

2.   Based upon this analysis, the Army should apply Bowen, Ledford, and Nathan's "Model for Hiring with Person-Organization Fit," or a similar model, to ensure that there is internal consistency in the Army's talent optimization system, with all functional components -- recruitment, selection, development, promotion, and retention -- focusing on these most essential attributes.

Appendix A

Mission Command Strategic End States	
1	All Army leaders understand and practice the Mission Command Philosophy.
2	Commanders and Staffs effectively execute Mission Command Warfighting Function tasks.
3	The Mission Command system enables commanders, staffs, and units to effectively execute the Mission Command Warfighting Function.

Figure 7. Mission Command Strategic End States

Six Principles of Mission Command	
1	Build cohesive teams through mutual trust
2	Create shared understanding
3	Provide a clear commander's intent
4	Exercise disciplined initiative
5	Use mission order
6	Accept prudent risk

Figure 8. Principles of Mission Command

Future Characteristics of the Army from The Army Vision: Strategic Advantage in a Complex World	
Characteristic	The Army must be…
Agile	…an agile organization, capable of responding to unforeseen events and seamlessly transitioning across the range of military operations.
Expert	…a highly skilled organization, possessing a deep understanding of a broad range of military, regional, and civil topics.
Innovative	…able to rapidly identify and grapple with complex problems and develop heuristics, to adapt and achieve results.
Interoperability	…able to easily support and enable join, whole-of-government and multinational land-based operations.
Expeditionary	…possess expeditionary capabilities to rapidly deploy from the continental US and sustain operations until strategic objectives are achieved.
Scalable	…ready to rapidly adjust the size of its units and attendant capabilities, aggregating and disaggregating forces to quickly and efficiently respond to operational demands.
Versatile	…versatile and possess a wide array of capabilities to operate effectively across the range of military operations.

Balance	…able to ensure the appropriate distribution of resources and capabilities across the Total Force.

Figure 9. Characteristics of the Future Army

Selection of Army Strategic Priorities 2014	
Adaptive Leaders for a Complex World	Recruit, identify, and develop talent informed by long-range trends.
	Educate leaders for an uncertain future.
	Train leaders and provide them with relevant experience.
A globally responsive and regionally engaged Army	Develop and implement Mission Tailored Forces.
	Reform, Restructure, and Rebalance the Generating Force.
	Continue to modernize business operations.
A ready and modern Army	Train for operational Adaptability.
	Adapt the Army Force Generation Model.
	Build resilient Mission Command at the Tactical and Operational Level.
The premier all volunteer Army	Optimize Soldier and Civilian acquisition, management and development.

Figure 10. Selection of Army Strategic Priorities for 2014

References

Army Capabilities Integration Center (ARCIC). "Army Vision – Force 2025 White Paper." January 23, 2014. Accessed March 18, 2015. http://www.arcic.army.mil/app_Documents/USArmy_WhitePaper_Army-Vision-Force-2025_23JAN2014.pdf

Bowen, David, Gerald Ledford, and Barry Nathan. "Hiring for the organization, not the job." *The Executive 5*, no 4. (1991): 35-51.

Breaugh, James, and Mary Starke. "Research on Employee Recruitment: So Many Studies, So Many Remaining Questions." *Journal of Management 26*, no. 3 (2000): 405-434.

Chatman, Jennifer. "Improving Interactional Organizational Research: A Model of Person-Organization Fit." *Academy of Management Review 14*, no. 3 (1989): 333-349.

Chatman, Jennifer. "Matching People and Organizations: Selection and socialization in public accounting firms." *Administrative Science Quarterly*, no. 36 (1991): 459-484.

Department of the Army, ADP 6-0: *Mission Command*. March 2014.

Department of the Army, ADRP 6-22: *Army Leadership*. September 2012.

Department of the Army, ARP 6-22: *Army Leadership*. September 2012.

Department of the Army, FM 6-22: *Army Leadership: Competent, Confident, Agile*. October 2006.

Department of the Army, *The U.S. Army Learning Concept for 2015*. TRADOC Pam 525-8-2. January 20, 2011.

Department of the Army, *US Army Mission Command Strategy: FY 13-19*. June 2013.

Department of the Army, *US Army Mission Command Assessment Plan: FY 15-19*. June 2015.

Department of the Army. *The U.S. Army Human Dimension Concept.* TRADOC Pam 525-3-7. May 21, 2014.

Department of the Army. *The U.S. Army Operating Concept: Win in a Complex World: 2020-2040*. TRADOC Pamphlet 525-3-1. October 31, 2014.

Department of the Army. *The U.S. Army Study of the Human Dimension in the Future 2015-2024*. TRADOC Pamphlet 525-3-7-01. April 2008.

Department of the Army. *Army Strategic Planning Guidance: 2014.*

Edwards, Jeffrey, "Person-Job Fit: A Conceptual integration, Literature Review and Methodological critique." *International Review of Industrial/Organizational Psychology 6* (1991): 283-357.

Edwards, Jeffrey, Daniel Cable, Ian Williamson, Lisa Schurer Lambert, and Abbie Shipp. "The Phenomenology of Fit: Linking the Person and Environment to the Subjective Experience of Person-Environment Fit." *Journal of Applied Psychology 91*, no. 4 (2006): 802-827.

Edwards, Jeffrey. "Person-Environment Fit in Organizations: An Assessment of Theoretical Progress." *The Academy of Management Annals 2*, no. 1 (2008): 167-230.

Fleishman, Edwin, and Michael Mumford. "Evaluating Classifications of Job Behavior: A Construct Validation of the Ability Requirement Scales." *Personnel Psychology 44*, no. 3 (1991): 523-575.

Grogran, Erin, and Peter Youngs. "Fitting in: Person-organization, person-job, and person-group fit as drivers of teacher mobility." The Education Policy Center, Michigan State University (2011): 1-58.

Horey, Jeffrey, Jon Fallensen, Ray Morath, Brian Cronin, Robert Cassella, Will Franks Jr., and Jason Smith. "Competency Based Future Leadership Requirements." Technical Report 1148. *U.S. Army Research Institute for the Behavioral and Social Sciences* (2004): 1-102.

Judge, Timothy, Amy Kristof-Brown, "Personality, Interactional Psychology and Person-Organization Fit." 2004 Personality, in Personality and Organizations (New Jersey: Lawrence Earlbaum Associates, 2004): 87-109.

Keeney, Ralph, and Robin Gregory. "Selecting Attributes to Measure the Achievement of Objectives." *Operations Research 53*, no. 1 (2005): 1-11.

Kristof, Amy. "Person-Organization Fit: An Integrative Review of its conceptualizations, measurement, and implications." *Journal of Personnel Psychology 49*. (1996): 1-49.

Kristof-Brown, Amy, Ryan Zimmerman, and Erin Johnson, "Consequences of Individuals' Fit at Work: A Meta-Analysis of Person-Job, Person-Organization, Person-Group, and Person-Supervisor Fit," *Personnel Psychology 58*, no. 2. (2005): 281-342.

Lewin, Kurt. "*Dynamic Theory of Personality.*" (New York: Mcgraw Hill, 1935).

Lewin, Kurt. "Defining the 'Field at a given time.'" Psychological Review 50 (1943): 292-310

McHugh, John, and Raymond Odierno. U.S. Congress. Senate. Committee on Committee on Armed Services. On the Posture of the United States Army. 114th Cong., 1st sess., (2015): 1-24.

McNeely, Bonnie, and Bruce Meglino. "Good Soldiers or Good Duty? The Role of Work Values and Contextual Antecedents in Prosocial Organizational Behavior." *Academy of Management Proceedings,* no. 1 (1992): 232-236.

Meglino, Bruce, and Elizabeth Ravlin. "Individual Values in Organizations: Concepts, Controversies, and Research." *Journal of* Management 24, no. 3 (1998): 351-389.

Milley, Mark A. 39th *Chief of Staff of the Army: Initial Message to the Army*. 2015

O'Reilly III, Charles, Jennifer Chatman, and David Caldwell. "People and Organizational Culture: A Profile Comparison Approach to Assessing Person-Organization Fit." *Academy of Management Journal* 34, no. 3 (1991): 487-516.

Paullin, Cheryl, Peter Legree, Andrea Sinclair, Karen Moriarty, Roy Campbell, and Robert Kilcullen. "Delineating Officer Performance and its Determinants." *Military Psychology 26*, no. 4 (2014): 259-277.

Schneider, Benjamin. "Fits about Fit." *Applied Psychology: An International Review 50*, no. 1 (2001): 141- 152.

Sumer, Canan, Nebi Sumer, Kursad Demirutku, and Sinan Cifci. "Using a Personality-Oriented Job Analysis to Identify Attributes to be assessed in Officer Selection." *Military Psychology 13*, no. 3 (2001): 129-146.

Sutarjo. "Ten ways of managing person-organization fit (P-O Fit) effectively: a Literature Study." International Journal of Business and Social Science 2, no. 21 (2011): 226-233.

Weber, Melvin, Dori Finley, Alleah Crawford, and David Rivera, Jr. "An exploratory study identifying soft skill competencies in entry level managers." *Journal of Tourism and Hospitality Research 9*, no. 4 (2009): 353-361.

Woulfe, James, *Into the Crucible: The Making of a 21st Century Marine*. New York: Presidio Press, 2000.